DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 798 EA 014 280

AUTHOR McCarthy, Martha; And Others
TITLE An Investigation of Supply of and Demand for School Administrators in Six States between 1975-76 and 1979-80.
PUB DATE 18 Dec 81
NOTE 53p.; Some tables may reproduce poorly due to small size of print in original document.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Education; *Administrators; Certification; Elementary Secondary Education; *Employment Patterns; Employment Projections; Employment Statistics; Higher Education; *Job Applicants; Job Placement; *Labor Market; Labor Needs; Labor Supply; Occupational Information; Occupational Surveys; Reduction in Force; School Districts; Superintendents; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *Administrator Supply and Demand

ABSTRACT

Data on the supply and demand ratio among school administrators were collected in six states (California, Georgia, Indiana, Massachusetts, Nebraska, and Texas) for the purposes of determining the availability of such data and the feasibility of comparing them across states and depicting supply and demand trends in the selected states. The supply pool variables considered were applicants' sex, level of academic preparation, and desired positions. Administrator demand variables were type and level of position, location (state), and type of school district (urban, suburban, medium city, and rural). Data sources included state departments of public instruction, higher education placement offices, superintendents from a sample of eight school districts in each of the six target states, and chairpersons of educational administration departments in the eight states. Problems in estimating supply and demand occurred because of difficulties in gathering data, differences in state certification, and diversity among states in record-keeping practices. The study indicates an oversupply of administrative job incumbents at the building level, especially in elementary schools. The only administrative positions for which an increase in demand was indicated were those related to federal funding priorities--special education directors/supervisors and supervisors of federal programs. A number of recommendations are offered for graduate education programs and school districts. A bibliography and eight data tables conclude the study. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED210798

An Investigation of Supply of and Demand for School Administrators in Six States Between 1975-76 and 1979-80

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Martha M. McCarthy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Martha McCarthy
Associate Professor
Indiana University

George Kuh
Associate Professor
Indiana University

Amy Zent
Special Education Supervisor
Indianapolis Public Schools

School of Education
Indiana University

December 18, 1981

EA 014 280

*The authors wish to acknowledge the assistance of Edith Sloan, elementary principal, Hobart, Indiana, in collecting data for this research project.

SUPPLY OF AND DEMAND FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

The problems associated with an imbalance in the supply of and demand for trained educational personnel have been acutely demonstrated during the past decade. In 1976, only 54% of the teacher education graduates who applied for teaching jobs were able to obtain full-time teaching positions; about 92,000 certified elementary and secondary teachers were unable to find positions commensurate with their training.[1] While individuals have suffered, the disproportionate supply/demand ratio has also had pernicious ramificatons for the education profession. For example, it is likely that a number of highly motivated and able students have selected other fields of study due to the poor employment opportunities in education. Furthermore, budget drawdowns associated with teacher education enrollment declines have precipitated a period of stress for preservice programs resulting in reductions in the numbers of faculty, staff, and graduate assistants.[2] In fact, some teacher education programs have been eliminated.[3] While an oversupply of potential job incumbents can have some positive effects on the profession (e.g., strengthening certification requirements and preparation program standards), without sufficient knowledge of supply/demand trends, the profession cannot adequately respond to market changes.

The education profession may be on the brink of another personnel imbalance similar to the disjunct between teaching positions and qualified candidates which characterized the 1970s. The negative consequence of a disproportionate supply/demand ratio among school administrators can possibly be avoided if a data based portrayal of the market situation is made

available to interested stakeholders (e.g., potential administration students, employed administrators, preparation program faculty, state department personnel, etc.).

In this paper, a data-based perspective on the supply of and demand for school administrators is presented. Specifically, the existing literature on this topic is summarized, and information about administrator supply/demand trends in six states is reported. The paper concludes with a discussion of the implications of the findings.

Related Literature

Although the total number of doctorates granted across fields decreased from 1972 through 1976, the number of individuals receiving doctor's degrees in education increased during this period.[4] The area of educational administration has contributed substantially to this increase; over 3,000 doctorates in school administration were awarded in 1976 and 1977 alone.[5] These data do not account for the significant number of classroom teachers who have earned masters and specialist degrees to meet school administration certification requirements in their respective states. In 1977, it was reported that there were no appreciable shortages of qualified school administrators to fill available positions in any region of the country.[6]

While the number of certified administrators has increased, there are indications that the demand for additional school administrators may decrease during the 1980s. For example, from 1970 until 1979, total public school enrollments declined in 39 states and the District of Columbia. By 1984, K-8 enrollments are predicted to decline 18% from the 1969 high of 36.8 million pupils.[7] Between 1984 and 1989, elementary enrollments are expected to reach

approximately 33.1 million, a level comparable to the number of students enrolled in 1977. High school enrollments are projected to decrease 22% by 1989 from the 1976 high of 15.7 million students. School administrators and board members have indicated that the issues associated with declining enrollments are among the most serious problems with which they must contend.[8]

Most of the inquiries into the relationship between school administrator supply and demand have been limited to individual states and conducted prior to 1975. In Minnesota, the demand for administrators decreased by about 20% from 1972 to 1975 but still exceeded the supply, especially for administrators with specialist and doctoral degrees.[9] Hughes predicted that the demand for school administrators in Wisconsin would surpass the supply for the period 1974-1979, with the greatest demand being for elementary principals.[10]

In Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, and West Virginia, however, an oversupply of administrators has been documented. Siefert reported that the supply of administrators exceeded the demand at each level of certification in Oklahoma.[11] In Pennsylvania, a supply of administrators six to ten times as great as the demand was reported in the early 1970s.[12] In the most recent study, the supply of certified administrators in West Virginia exceeded the demand for all positions with the exception of special education central office personnel.[13]

The Indiana University Placement Office reported that the percentage of individuals prepared as school administrators who did not assume administrative positions following completion of their studies increased steadily from 13% in 1975-76 to 26% in 1977-78.[14] These data supported the findings of Nagel and Nagel who documented that the national placement rate for school administration doctoral recipients was about 65% in 1978.[15] Reports from the National Center

for Educational Statistics indicated that for the years 1975-76, 1976-77, and 1977-78, the total number of administrative positions remained fairly stable at approximately 170,000, with about 4.4% of all educational personnel identified as administrators.[16]

Given that public school enrollments have declined, doctoral degree recipients in school administration have increased substantially, and the need for additional administrators has not been documented, the education profession may be edging toward another supply and demand disjunct. Information about the supply of and demand for administrators from different states during a comparable time period can be used to determine the degree to which an imbalance exists.

Administrator Supply/Demand Data From Six States

The limited scope inquiries into the supply of and demand for school administrators have not produced data comparable across states and years. For this study, data were collected in six states representing different geographic regions of the continental United States: California, Georgia, Indiana, Massachusetts, Nebraska, and Texas. The project had two purposes: (1) to determine the availability of administrator supply/demand data and the feasibility of comparing such data across states; and (2) to depict supply/demand trends in the selected states. The primary variables of interest in the supply pool were sex, level of academic preparation, and specific positions for which individuals were prepared. Of interest in analyzing administrator demand were type and level of position, state, and type of school district (urban, suburban, medium city, and rural).

Procedures

Supply Data

Supply data in the six target states were provided by personnel from state departments of public instruction and placement offices in institutions of higher education. Survey questionnaires and telephone calls were used to query state department personnel as to the number of individuals certified in specific administrative positions from 1975-76 through 1979-80. Information was received from all six states. However, Nebraska was unable to provide the number of individuals receiving certification by year; only data on the number of certified administrators employed in the state in 1979-80 were available.

The numbers of individuals being prepared to assume school administrative positions were gathered from placement offices in all institutions of higher education with graduate programs in educational administration in the six states. Of the 92 placement offices contacted, 62 responded. Usable information was obtained from 41 institutions for a response rate of 44% (CA, 42%; GA, 29%; IN, 88%; MA, 31%; NB, 33%; TX, 48%). Placement office directors provided information about the administrative positions for which their institutions prepared students in 1976-77, 1977-78, and 1978-79. Also, they indicated the areas of specialization of students (by sex) who completed masters, specialists (Ed.S.) and doctors degrees in educational administration for the respective years. It was the intent to gather placement office data from 1975-76 through 1979-80. However, because of the timing of the data gathering activity, most placement offices did not have 1979-80 data compiled in a reportable form. Also, only a few respondents supplied 1975-76 data, so these data were omitted from the analysis.

Demand Data

Administrator demand data were provided primarily by superintendents from a stratified random sample of eight school districts in each of the six target states. Two school districts per state were selected from the following categories:

1. Urban - Population of 185,000 or more. The city in which the school district is located is recognized as a major population center by the United States Bureau of Census and is the center of what is defined by the Bureau of Budget as a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA).

2. Suburban - Located within 30 miles of a major urban city (as defined above) and included in the urban city's SMSA.

3. Medium City - Population of 29,000 - 160,000 and not part of an urban city's SMSA.

4. Rural - Population below 12,000 and not located within 50 miles of any larger center of population.

A questionnaire was sent to the superintendents of the 48 school districts in the target population. The form provided nine categories of central office positions (assistant or associate superintendent, administrative assistant, director of special education, director of federally funded programs, other directors such as elementary education and guidance, special education supervisor, supervisor of federally funded programs, other supervisors such as media and curriculum, and "other" central office administrators) and seven categories of building administrators (elementary principal, assistant elementary principal, middle or junior high school principal, assistant middle or junior high school principal, high school principal, assistant high school principal, and "other" building administrators). Superintendents were asked to provide information concerning:

1. Number of administrators hired from 1975-76 to 1979-80 by position;

2. Number of positions added or reduced from 1975-76 to 1979-80 and the causes for the additions and reductions by position;

3. Number of administrators presently employed by position;

4. Number of expected retirees from 1980-81 to 1984-85 by position; and

5. Projected number of and probable causes for position additions or reductions from 1980-81 to 1984-85.

Follow-up telephone calls were made to approximately one third of the superintendents. Of the 43 superintendent forms returned, 38 included usable information for a response rate of 79%. Response rates by state were: California - 88%, Georgia - 50%, Indiana - 88%, Massachusetts - 88%, Nebraska - 88%, and Texas - 75%. Response rates by type of district were: urban - 50%, suburban - 92%, medium city - 83%, and rural - 92%.

Chairpersons of preparation programs in educational administration departments in the target states provided a second source of demand data. It was felt that information on the placement of individuals recently completing administrative degree programs would provide a different perspective on the demand for administrative personnel (e.g., the type and locale of positions recently secured). Educational administration program chairpersons were sent a form that listed 20 positions similar to those included on the superintendent form described above. In addition, categories were provided to account for persons who secured employment as teachers, in education agencies outside local districts, or in positions outside education. Chairpersons were queried regarding the types of positions secured by educational administration

graduates from 1975-76 to 1979-80 and whether the graduates were placed within or outside of the state of the degree granting institution. Data supplied for the year 1975-76 were incomplete and data for 1979-80 were not yet available from most institutions querried; therefore, the analysis was limited to a three-year span. Of the 91 institutions contacted,[17] 79 responded. However, usable data were received only from 38 institutions for a response rate of 42% (CA, 45%; GA, 29%; IN, 71%; MA, 20%; NB, 50%; TX, 43%).

Logical Analyses

Frequencies and percentages were computed for all variables. Supply data from university placement offices were arrayed by year and position within states and across states. Also, numbers of individuals prepared to assume administrative roles were compared by sex for a three year period (1976-77 to 1978-79). State department data reflecting numbers of administrative certificates issued were analyzed within states for the years 1975-76 to 1979-80.

Information pertaining to administrative additions and reductions provided by the 38 superintendents was arrayed by position, year, state, and type of school district. Data on anticipated retirements from 1980-81 to 1984-85 were analyzed by position. Because less than a fourth of the superintendents supplied information on projected additions or reductions in administrative personnel, these data were not analyzed. Data from educational administration department chairpersons about type and locale of positions secured by graduates were tabulated by position across states and within each state.

Problems in Estimating Supply and Demand

Difficulties in gathering data pertaining to supply and demand have been succinctly summarized by Hooker:

> Both supply and demand are nebulous, elastic concepts, having many of the properties of an invisible gas which expands, contracts and takes different shapes as the result of external forces. Scientific investigation of these concepts without the assistance of sophisticated controls and techniques is therefore hazardous to say the least, all of which may explain why investigators have reported few studies of this nature.[18]

Equally perplexing to the persons conducting this study and surely to education policymakers were the differences between state certification practices. For example, California uses one administrative credential to certify all school administrators; Georgia uses two; Nebraska employs three classifications; Massachusetts and Texas issue four types of certificates; and Indiana uses seven categories for administrative certification purposes. In some states, such as Texas, a principal can be certified with a middle management certificate or with a principalship certificate. In Massachusetts and Indiana, principals are certified by level, elementary or secondary. In addition, individuals may hold multiple certification; thus, raw numbers of certificates issued may present an inflated picture of the actual availability pool.

Currently, considerable diversity also exists among states in record keeping practices, and some states do not maintain complete records on the numbers of individuals certified for administrative roles.[19] To illustrate,

Nebraska state department personnel could provide data only on the number of certified administrators who held positions for the year 1979-80. From Indiana, certification data were available only since 1978 because statistics have been collapsed for the preceding twelve year period. Also, Indiana, Georgia, and Massachusetts record data by calendar years, while California, Nebraska, and Texas use fiscal years. In California, the number of certificates issued each year includes newly certified individuals as well as certification renewals required every five years. Therefore, the California data reflect an unknown number of persons who are not entering the educational administration availability pool for the first time.

In addition to the vagaries associated with record keeping and certification practices, there are other variables affecting supply and demand that cannot be assessed accurately. Data on the total number of individuals that satisfy credential standards are elusive. In 1978, Metz observed that information on numbers of teachers meeting administrative certification requirements were nonexistent.[20] Another complicating factor is that in some states there are large numbers of individuals who are practicing administrators but who do not hold proper administrative credentials.[21] Also, the availability of personnel from other states and the characteristics of incumbents themselves (professional aspirations, mobility, age, etc.) affect the supply/demand picture. Furthermore, state initiatives such as the provision of incentives for early retirement can influence the demand for administrators. Given these limitations, the data reported and discussed in this paper fall short of a precise portrayal of the supply of and demand for school administrators and should be interpreted with some caution.

Supply Information

The supply of school administrators is comprised of persons currently holding administrative certification and persons receiving administrative certificates each year. The supply pool described below reflects the numbers of persons completing educational administration preparation programs and seeking administrative positions from 1976-77 through 1979-80 and the numbers of individuals receiving certification from 1975-76 through 1979-80 in the target states. There is no attempt to estimate the number of individuals teaching in 1979-80 who might meet certification requirements but not be enrolled in formal degree programs.

Administrative Certification 1975-76 to 1979-80

Because the six states use different certification and record keeping practices, comparisons across the states of the types and numbers of administrative certificates issued from 1975-76 through 1979-80 are not meaningful. However, patterns within five of the states (excluding Nebraska) can be discerned (Table 1). In general, neither significant increases nor decreases in the overall numbers receiving certificates were reported, although Indiana data reflected a slight increase in all certification categories between 1978 and 1980. Only in the area of special education administration was there a continual and substantial increase in the number of certificates issued.

Insert Table 1 about here

The California data reflected a unique pattern, explained in part by a change in state certification requirements. Prior to 1978, certification could be attained by passing a written examination. Since 1979, however, individuals have been required to complete an accredited preparation program to be eligible for certification. While the total numbers of individuals certified for administrative roles in California in 1975-76 and 1979-80 were comparable (approximately 5,000), sharp differences for the intervening years were reported (Table 1).

Recently Prepared Administrators Seeking Positions, 1976-77 to 1978-79

Placement offices in institutions of higher education with school administration preparation programs in the six states provided information on the numbers of males and females prepared for and seeking various administrative positions by degree for 1976-77, 1977-78, and 1978-79 (Tables 2 - 5).

Trends Across States. Data from the six states indicated that the numbers prepared across degree programs for administrative positions were comparable for 1976-77 and 1978-79, with a slight dip in 1977-78. The numbers prepared for the superintendency increased 15% between 1976-77 and 1978-79 (Table 2), but the numbers prepared for secondary administrative roles decreased about 13% during this period (Table 3). The numbers prepared for elementary administrative positions across degree programs remained fairly stable for the three year period (Table 4), and there was a steady increase in the numbers prepared for special education administrative roles (Table 5).

Insert Tables 2 - 5 about here

The number of superintendents prepared at the master's degree level declined and the number receiving specialist degrees increased significantly,

probably reflecting the fact that certification requirements for superintendents have been upgraded in recent years. Throughout the three year period, most individuals specializing in elementary and secondary administration were prepared at the master's degree level. When administrative positions were combined, 81% were prepared at the master's level, 13% at the specialist level, and 6% at the doctoral level for 1978-79.

A few areas showed distinct sex differences. Males comprised over four-fifths of those prepared for the superintendency for the three year period (1976-77 - 85%, 1977-78 - 80%, 1978-79 - 83%) and about three fourths of the secondary administration graduates (1976-77 - 77%; 1977-78 - 79%; 1978-79 - 72%). However, there was a 7% increase in the percentage of women among those seeking secondary administrative positions between 1977-78 and 1978-79. Female representation among elementary administration graduates steadily increased over the three year period, and the male/female ratio approached parity in 1978-79 (M - 53%, F - 47%). Women dominated the preparation programs for special education administrators which were offered in three states. Three fifths of the individuals receiving degrees in this area in 1978-79, almost three fourths in 1977-78, and over 80% in 1976-77 were females.

Trends Within States. Data from the 14 California institutions of higher education reflected a relatively stable pattern as to total numbers of individuals prepared for administrative positions over the three year period. Only in the area of special education administration was there a marked increase in numbers prepared from 1976-77 to 1978-79. There was an increase in the number of females and a decrease in the number of males prepared for elementary administrative positions. In 1978-79, women comprised 55% of

those prepared in this area. Overall in California, females comprised 43% of the total number of individuals prepared for school administrative roles in 1978-79. While master's level training was dominant, the proportion of students prepared for administrative roles at the Ed.S. or Ed.D/Ph.D levels increased from 7% in 1976-77 to 16% in 1978-79.

In Texas (n = 11 institutions), the total numbers of individuals prepared for administrative positions remained fairly constant over the three years. However, the proportion of men and women completing administrative degree programs changed during this time. The percentage of women receiving combined elementary-secondary certification increased significantly over the three year period, from 30% in 1976-77 to 43% in 1978-79. There was little change reflected in the type of degrees awarded for the three year period; about 82% of the individuals receiving degrees in educational administration were prepared at the master's level for each of the years investigated.

Information from the four Nebraska institutions indicated that females were overrepresented at the elementary administration level (73% of those prepared in 1978-79), and males were overrepresented at the secondary level (100% in 1978-79). A separate category for the superintendency was not reported. None of the Nebraska institutions indicated that individuals were prepared for administrative roles above the master's degree level.

In Indiana (n = 7 institutions), superintendent preparation was concentrated at the specialist degree and doctoral levels, reflecting state certification requirements. Only 3% of the superintendents were prepared at the master's level in 1978-79. A slight decline was noted in the numbers prepared for administrative roles over the three year period; this decline was more pronounced at the secondary administration level. However, there was a marked

increase in the proportion of females completing secondary administrative degree programs (15% in 1976-77, 21% in 1977-78, 36% in 1978-79). Overall, the percentage of women prepared for administrative roles in Indiana increased from 18% in 1976-77 to 27% in 1978-79.

Massachusetts institutions (n = 5) indicated a fairly stable pattern in total numbers prepared for administrative positions for the three years with preparation concentrated at the master's degree level. The percentage of women prepared for administrative roles steadily increased (19% in 1976-77 to 31% in 1978-79). Few degrees were awarded in elementary education administration over the three year period (less than 5% of the total administrative degrees). As in Nebraska, Massachusetts institutions did not record a separate classification for the superintendency.

Trends could not be identified for Georgia since only two institutions provided the requested data, and numbers reported were too small for meaningful comparisons to be made.

Demand Information

Superintendents in 38 school districts provided information on the numbers of (1) administrators hired between 1975-76 and 1979-80 by position, (2) additions and reductions in administrative positions during this time, and (3) incumbent administrators employed in 1979-80 by position. Approximately half of the superintendents also projected the number of expected retirements among administrators between 1980-81 and 1984-85. In addition, educational administration department chairpersons provided data on numbers of graduates placed in administrative positions from 1976-77 through 1978-79.

Position Additions/Reductions

Between 1975-76 and 1979-80, more additions (n = 124) than reductions (n = 108) in administrative positions were reported (Table 6). Additional central office positions exceeded reductions by almost two to one (90 to 49), but most of these additions occurred prior to 1978. In 1979-80, central office reductions outnumbered additions. A different pattern characterized fluctuations in the number of building administrators. For the five-year period, building level roles experienced 42% more reductions than additions (59 and 34 respectively, Table 6). Reductions were more pronounced in 1979-80 than in the four preceding years and were concentrated in the elementary principalship and assistant principalship which accounted for almost three fourths of the reductions.

Insert Table 6 about here

The primary reason given by superintendents for reductions in force was decreasing state or local funds. Declining enrollments and school closings were the next most frequently noted reasons. The reasons most often cited for additional positions were the implementation of new programs or the availability of federal funds. Only one district reported that a new position was added due to an increase in enrollment.

Position Additions/Reductions by Type of District. Some marked differences were noted when data provided by superintendents were cross tabulated by type of school district (Table 6). Practically no reductions in administrative positions from 1975-76 to 1979-80 were reported in the 11 rural districts.

Almost as many positions were added in these districts in the single year, 1979-80, as for the prior four years combined. Most of the additional positions were in central office roles.

In the ten medium city districts, a different pattern emerged. The number of administrative positions added from 1975-76 through 1978-79 outnumbered reductions. However, in 1979-80, the converse was true. There were two and a half times as many reductions as additions documented for this one year. The reductions were divided among central office and building positions, with only the elementary principalship experiencing a loss of three or more positions.

In suburban districts (n = 11), there were slightly more additions than reductions reported in both central office and building administrative positions for the period 1975-76 to 1978-79. For the 1979-80 academic year, few additions or reductions were documented in the suburban districts.

Superintendents from the six urban districts reported over 40% more additions than reductions from 1975-76 until 1978-79. However, most of these additions were in central office administrative roles (n = 41). For building administrators, there were over three times as many reductions as additions for this period. The urban districts reported 45% more reductions than additions in 1979-80, and these reductions were not concentrated in particular types of positions.

For the five year period, urban and rural districts reported more additions than reductions in overall numbers of administrative positions. These additions were heavily concentrated at the central office level. Urban districts reported

a substantial reduction in building administrators for the five year period. Medium city districts also reported significant reductions in building administrative positions as well as an overall reduction in administrative positions from 1975-76 to 1979-80. The suburban districts reflected a fairly stable pattern throughout the period under investigation, with slightly more additions overall than reductions.

Position Additions/Reductions by State. California school districts (n = 7), reported over twice as many additions (n = 45) as reductions (n = 20) in administrative positions from 1975-76 until 1978-79. Most of these additions were in central office positions (n = 34), with over a third of the central office additions in the area of special education. In 1979-80, however, slightly more reductions (n = 7) than additions (n = 5) were reported by the California districts. While the 1979-80 reductions were evenly distributed among central office and building positions, all additions for this period were in building administrative roles and were associated with a federally funded compensatory education project in one urban district.

Superintendents in Massachusetts school districts (n = 7) reported almost the same number of reductions (n = 13) as additions (n = 14) in central office and building administrators from 1975-76 until 1978-79. In 1979-80, a balance in additions and reductions was indicated at the building level, but four reductions and no additions in central office staff were reported. Over the five year period, there were 15% more staff reductions than additions.

The Nebraska superintendents from seven school districts documented twice as many additions (n = 6) as reductions (n = 3) from 1975-76 until 1978-79, but no additions compared with five reductions in 1979-80. These reductions were not concentrated in any specific position.

The six participating Texas superintendents indicated that there were no reductions compared with 14 additions in their districts from 1975-76 until 1978-79. The additions were divided among central office and building roles. In 1979-80, a comparable number of additions and reductions were reported.

In Indiana, seven superintendents indicated that there were 65% more reductions (n = 38) than additions (n = 24) in administrative positions in their school districts from 1975-76 until 1978-79 and fifty percent more reductions (n = 15) than additions (n = 10) in 1979-80. Reductions were most pronounced in the elementary principalship.

Superintendents from four Georgia school districts reported a stable pattern for all years investigated. The numbers of reductions and additions were negligible.

For the period under study, only California and Texas reported more additions than reductions in administrative positions. Additions were most pronounced in central office roles related to special education and federal projects. In the states reporting more reductions than additions, only elementary building administrative roles reflected disproportionate losses.

Projected Retirements

Less than 5% of the currently employed administrators were expected to retire during the 1980-81 to 1984-85 period, and the retirements were not concentrated in any particular positions (not tabled). However, since only 20 of the 38 superintendents estimated administrator retirements, this information should be interpreted with extreme caution.

Percentage of Administrators Hired Since 1975-76

Using the data reported by superintendents on numbers of administrators hired from 1975-76 through 1979-80 (recent hires) and the total numbers of administrators employed in 1979-80, the percentage of job incumbents recently hired was calculated for each position by type of district and state (Table 7). For all 38 districts, the positions reflecting the highest proportions of recent hires were special education supervisors (71%) and directors of federally funded programs (64%). In contrast, only 18% of the elementary principals and central office directors of personnel, elementary education, secondary education, guidance, and pupil personnel were hired between 1975-76 and 1979-80. For most other administrative positions, recent hires comprised between 30% and 45% of the 1979-80 job incumbents.

Insert Table 7 about here

Patterns among the six states differed substantially as to percentages of new hires. Data from the school districts in Georgia and Indiana indicated that 60% and 52% respectively of the administrators employed in 1979-80 had been hired within the past five years. In contrast, recent hires comprised 27% of the administrators employed in 1979-80 in Texas, 28% in Massachusetts, 30% in Nebraska, and 33% in California (not tabled).

Differences were not as pronounced when the percentage of recent hires was analyzed by type of school district. Suburban (37%), urban (35%), and medium city districts (36%) exhibited comparable proportions of administrators employed in 1979-80 who had been hired since 1975-76. However, over half (56%) of the administrators employed in the rural districts in 1979-80 were recent hires.

Placement of Educational Administration Graduates

The numbers of persons who are placed in administrative positions upon completion of preparation programs provide another source of administrative demand data. These data were obtained from 41 school administration department chairpersons in institutions of higher education in the six target states. Between 1976-77 and 1978-79 approximately three fourths of the individuals completing administrative degree programs were placed in administrative positions. Forty four percent were placed in building administrative roles and 29% in central office positions. About 17% assumed K-12 teaching positions, and 8% either took noneducation roles (7%) or were still seeking employment (less than 1%). Of those persons who secured an administrative position, 87% remained in the same state as the preparation institution. Of those employed in another state, 38% found building administrative positions, 23% central office positions, and 23% K-12 teaching jobs (Table 8).

Insert Table 8 about here

Educational administration departments in Georgia (n = 2) reported the largest percentage of central office placements (47% of the graduates), and over one fourth of these persons found positions outside of Georgia. Nebraska and Indiana universities (n = 3, 5 respectively) indicated that almost three fifths of the educational administration graduates were placed in building administrative roles. Massachusetts departments of educational administration (n = 3) reported that over half (53%) of the graduates assumed K-12 teaching positions following completion of their administrative preparation programs. Massachusetts universities also reported the largest percentage of individuals taking jobs outside education or not placed (14%), and Nebraska institutions reported the lowest percentage in this category (3%).

While nearly three fourths of educational administration program graduates acquired administrative positions, these data do not account for persons completing administrative certification requirements who are not enrolled in degree programs. Therefore, this information should not be interpreted as a placement rate for persons certified for and seeking administrative positions.

Discussion

The apparent oversupply of building administrative job incumbents, especially in elementary roles, is of particular interest given that administrative preparation efforts focus on building level roles. The only administrative positions for which an increase in demand was indicated were special education directors/supervisors and supervisors of federal programs. The recent increases in both of these roles are related to federal funding priorities. Given that the federal government currently is disposed toward reducing educational appropriations, a continued demand for such positions seems unlikely.[22]

Preparation program thrusts and student advising practices should realistically reflect employment market fluctuations. Additional preparation emphases on what appear to be rather nontraditional administrative roles (e.g., staff development directors, program evaluators, directors of research) seem warranted as the data suggested a stable demand for such roles. Moreover, expansion of the number and breadth of training experiences is needed to prepare students for a variety of positions in different types of school districts. Also, information about saturated roles (e.g., elementary building administrators) as well as roles where there is still a demand for new administrators should be made available to prospective and currently enrolled students.

Educational administration preparation programs also may need to modify what seem to be parochial orientations. For the most part, administrative training programs traditionally have been "state bound" in that most of their graduates have been placed within 100 miles of the degree granting institution.[23] In the next decade, preparation programs that are sensitive to pluralistic issues may have more success in placing graduates in states where a demand for administrators still exists. For example, if training programs in the midwest would emphasize bilingual concerns, their graduates might be more marketable in western states where the demand for such administrators remains high.

The apparent oversupply of building administrators also has implications for policy makers in state and local education agencies. Monetary incentives for administrators in rural and urban districts might be included in state school funding schemes. Perhaps such incentives might motivate individuals to move from medium city school districts where administrative positions are being reduced at a more rapid rate than in urban and rural settings.

When the supply of qualified applicants exceeds the demand, efforts to raise entrance requirements (i.e., certification) usually are accelerated. It may be an appropriate time for the profession to identify the competencies necessary for satisfactory administrative performance and to reflect them in certification requirements. Administrative certification requirements currently range from a written examination to a minimum number of graduate courses to completion of a specialist degree. Moreover, in some states there are practicing administrators who do not hold certificates. For example, in 1980, Martin and Andes reported that a substantial portion of the currently employed administrators in West Virginia were not properly credentialed even though there was

an oversupply of certified administrators in the state.[24] Such practices might become more difficult to justify in the future.

The decreased mobility of incumbent administrators, characteristic of a saturated market, may significantly reduce turnover and increase the length of tenure of incumbent administrators. Therefore, local education agencies may need to give greater attention to administrator in-service programs to ensure that incumbents keep abreast of the expanding educational technology. Also, local school districts may find it necessary to revise practices currently used to evaluate administrative performance. As the competition for fewer administrative openings becomes increasingly keen, criteria for judging applicants for available positions may become more explicit and, perhaps, more stringently applied. Definitive standards for judging satisfactory performance may be sought to document whether currently employed administrators evidence professional competencies considered necessary for satisfactory job performance. Local districts or regional cooperatives might institute assessment centers in which administrators regularly receive feedback on performance and assistance in designing professional improvement plans.[25]

Changes in the supply/demand picture also have implications for affirmative action efforts. The supply data in this study provided support for prior reports indicating an increase in the proportion of women preparing for administrative roles.[26] Yet, the male/female ratio in the supply pool appears quite discrepant from reports of male and female representation in the field. In 1978 and 1980 studies,[27] 18% and 27% respectively of elementary principalships were occupied by women. The preparation program data from these six states

indicated that 43% of the degree recipients prepared for elementary principalships were women. Similarly, in 1977 and 1981 studies,[28] 7% and 10% respectively of the secondary principals were women compared with 23% of the degree recipients in the current study. Even more discrepant were the figures pertaining to the superintendency. Almost a fifth of the degree recipients prepared to be superintendents were women, but the most recent field study indicated that less than 2% of the nation's superintendents were women.[29] Assuming that the data reported in this study accurately reflect the male/female ratio in the supply pool, a declining demand for school administrators may have a disproportionate impact on women. As the job market becomes increasingly tighter, perhaps males who have traditionally had more opportunities for entry level administrative posts will fare better than women in securing line leadership jobs.

Moreover, women as well as minorities may be disproportionately affected by retrenchment efforts. Women and minorities are overrepresented among recent hires,[30] and therefore may be the first released as positions are eliminated. The use of other criteria in addition to seniority for reducing personnel as well as alternatives to staff reductions, such as incentives for early retirements, should be explored as to their utility for renewal of the profession. In addition, school districts possibly could institute different staffing configurations. For example, to cope with reductions, a district might combine certain central office functions in a rotating position to be filled every year by a different person. This would provide administrative experience for a larger number of individuals as well as increase the chances that fresh insights might be introduced into central office planning and

decisionmaking. Care is required, however, to ensure that such a policy does not promote tokenism or serve to screen out minorities and women from permanent central office appointments.

The data reported earlier suggest a declining demand for school administrators (particularly at the elementary level) and a stable supply of certified individuals. However, data limitations preclude the formulation of concrete conclusions. Indeed, the education profession cannot make enlightened policy decisions based on the data currently available from state departments and from various sources within institutions of higher education. It is understandable why educational policymakers might be reluctant to take action based on what appear to be incomplete supply and demand data such as those reported here.

In this instance, the problem is the solution. Greater standardization across and within state certification requirements and record keeping practices is needed. Perhaps regional accrediting associations will take the leadership in this area. Without some degree of uniformity, accurate supply and demand data will remain elusive, perhaps at a substantial cost to current and aspiring educational administrators.

Footnotes

1. A. S. Metz, Teacher and School Administrator Supply and Demand (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1979), p. 1.

2. P. A. Zirkel and R. T. Cyr, "Are Teacher Educators Seeing the Future Through Rose Colored Glasses?" Phi Delta Kappan 62 (March, 1981):524-525.

3. J. Magarrell, "How Two Universities Are Preparing to Cope," The Chronicle of Higher Education (January 7, 1980):7.

4. National Research Council, Summary Report 1976 Doctorate Recipients from U.S. Universities (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1977), p. 3.

5. National Research Council, Summary Report 1977 Doctorate Recipients from U.S. Universities (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1978), p. 15.

6. Metz, Teacher and School Administrator Supply and Demand, p. 31.

7. Educational Research Service, Indications of Future School Enrollments (Arlington, Virginia: Authors, 1980), pp. 3-6.

8. See F. L. Dembowski, G. Gay, and J. Owings, "Sober Facts Spell Out the Impact of Enrollment Decline," American School Board Journal 167 (August, 1980):30. Also see T. A. Shannon, "School Demographics Challenge Us All," American School Board Journal, 166 (June, 1979):43.

9. C. P. Hooker, The Supply and Demand of Public School Administrators in Minnesota (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1976), pp. 40-41, 53.

10. B. H. Hughes, The Supply and Demand for School Administrators in Wisconsin (Superior, Wisconsin: Department of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin-Superior, 1974), pp. 62-64.

11. E. H. Siefert, "The Supply and Demand of Public School Administrators in Oklahoma," (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1976).

12. M. C. Nagy, "Selected Factors Relating to the Supply of and Demand for Administrators in Pennsylvania Public Schools," (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1971).

13. J. A. Martin and J. Andes, Supply and Demand of Public School Administrators in West Virginia (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1980).

14. D. Lackey, "Educational Placement, 1977-78" (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University School of Education, 1979).

15. J. M. Nagle and E. E. Nagle, "Doctoral Programs in Educational Administration," in Paula Silver and Dennis Spuck, 3ds., Preparatory Programs for Educational Administrators in the United States (Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1978).

16. B. J. Foster and J. M. Carpenter, Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Day Schools, 1975 (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1977); Foster and Carpenter, Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Day Schools, 1976 (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1977); Foster and Carpenter, Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Day Schools, 1977-78 (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1979).

17. There was one less school administration department than placement office because Indiana University has a placement office in Indianapolis and Bloomington, Indiana.

18. Hooker, The Supply and Demand of Public School Administrators in Minnesota, p. 1.

19. See S. J. Knezevich, Doctorate Needs in Educational Administration During the 1970s and 1980s: A Preliminary Analysis (Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1974), p. 21.

20. Metz, Teacher and School Administrator Supply and Demand, p. 31.

21. See Martin and Andes, Supply and Demand of Public School Administrators in West Virginia, pp. 21-22, 80-81.

22. See D. L. Clark and M. A. Amiot, "The Impact of the Reagan Administration on Federal Education Policy," Phi Delta Kappan, 63 (December, 1981):258-262.

23. D. W. Smuck, W. J. Davis, and P. Silver, "A Descriptive Study of Administrator Training Programs," UCEA Review, 20 (Fall, 1979).

24. See Martin and Andes, Supply and Demand of Public School Administrators in West Virginia.

25. P. W. Hersey, "NASSP's Assessment Center - From Concept to Practice," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 61 (September, 1977):74-76.

26. M. M. McCarthy, G. D. Kuh and J. Beckman, "Characteristics and Attitudes of Doctoral Students in Educational Administration," Phi Delta Kappan, 61 (November, 1979):200-203.

27. See W. L. Pharis and S. B. Zakariya, The Elementary School Principalship in 1978: A Research Study (Arlington, Va: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1979), pp. 4-5; M. McCarthy and A. Zent, "School Administrators: 1980 Profile," Planning and Changing 12 (Fall, 1981):147-150.

28. See D. R. Byrne, S. A. Hines, and L. E. McCleary, The Senior High School Principalship, vol. 1 (Reston, Va: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978), p. 1; McCarthy and Zent, "School Administrators: 1980 Profile," pp. 147-150.

29. G. C. Coffin and R. B. Ekstron, "Aspirations, Experiences, and Roadblocks to Hiring Women in Educational Administration," paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New York, April, 1977.

30. McCarthy and Zent, "School Administrators: 1980 Profile," pp. 150-153.

Table 1

School Administrators Certified by Year and State

Areas of Certification	Georgia					Indiana			Massachusetts					
	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1978	1979	1980	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980
Superintendent						160 (34)	150 (33)	150 (33)	140 (16)	150 (18)	145 (17)	130 (15)	155 (18)	130 (15)
Admin. & Superv.	450 (13)	830 (23)	670 (19)	800 (22)	810 (23)									
Middle Management														
Supervisors														
High School Prin.						400 (36)	320 (28)	400 (36)	640 (23)	440 (16)	400 (14)	320 (12)	500 (18)	450 (16)
Elem. Principal						260 (32)	270 (33)	275 (35)	480 (18)	490 (19)	400 (15)	420 (16)	450 (17)	400 (15)
Principal														
Dir. of Spec. Ed.	20 (13)	30 (19)	30 (19)	35 (23)	40 (26)	10 (22)	15 (33)	20 (45)						
Administrative Credential														

Note: Numbers in parentheses reflect in-state percentages.

Table 1, continued

School Administrators Certified by Year and State

Areas of Certification	Texas					California				
	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
Superintendent	140 (21)	150 (23)	130 (20)	180 (28)	50 (8)					
Admin. & Superv.										
Middle Management	840 (16)	1,020 (20)	1,120 (22)	1,100 (21)	1,100 (21)					
Supervisors	1,000 (26)	760 (19)	750 (19)	700 (18)	700 (18)					
High School Prin.										
Elem. Principal										
Principal	50 (20)	45 (18)	45 (18)	45 (18)	60 (25)					
Dir. of Spec. Ed.										
Administrative Credential						5,478 (14)	10,500 (26)	15,961 (39)	3,433 (9)	5,018 (12)

Note: Numbers in parentheses reflect in-state percentages.

Table 2

Recently Prepared Administrators Seeking Superintendent Positions

1976-77 to 1978-79 by State, Sex, and Degree

State	Sex	1976 - 77 Masters n	% [a]	Ed. S. n	% [a]	Doctors n	% [a]	1977 - 78 Masters n	% [a]	Ed. S. n	% [a]	Doctors n	% [a]	1978 - 79 Masters n	% [a]	Ed. S. n	% [a]	Doctors n	% [a]	Total: 1976-77 to 1978-79 Masters n	% [a]	Ed. S. n	% [a]	Doctors n	% [a]
California (n=14)	Men	29	(69)	6	(100)	1	(50)	28	(67)	1	(100)	2	(100)	22	(71)	9	(82)	2	(100)	79	(69)	16	(89)	5	(83)
	Women	13	(31)	0		1	(50)	14	(33)	0		0		9	(29)	2	(18)	0		36	(31)	2	(11)	1	(17)
Georgia (n=2)	Men	0		1	(100)	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		1	(25)	0	
	Women	0		0		0		0		1	(100)	0		0		2	(100)	0		0		3	(75)	0	
Indiana (n=7)	Men	2	(100)	33	(94)	14	(88)	4	(100)	21	(95)	17	(89)	2	(100)	33	(94)	25	(78)	8	(100)	87	(95)	56	(84)
	Women	0		2	(6)	2	(12)	0		1	(5)	2	(11)	0		2	(6)	7	(22)	0		5	(5)	11	(16)
Mass. (n=5)	Men	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
	Women	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
Nebraska (n=4)	Men	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
	Women	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
Texas (n=11)	Men	16	(89)	11	(92)	10	(91)	16	(76)	17	(77)	8	(100)	18	(72)	20	(80)	8	(89)	50	(78)	48	(81)	26	(93)
	Women	2	(11)	1	(8)	1	(9)	5	(24)	5	(23)	0		7	(28)	5	(20)	1	(11)	14	(22)	11	(19)	2	(7)
All States	Men	47	(76)	51	(94)	25	(86)	48	(72)	39	(85)	27	(93)	42	(72)	62	(85)	35	(95)	137	(73)	152	(88)	87	(92)
	Women	15	(24)	3	(6)	4	(14)	19	(18)	7	(15)	2	(7)	16	(28)	11	(15)	2	(5)	50	(27)	21	(12)	8	(8)

[a] Reflects percentage of male and femal degree recipients for each state by year

Table 3

Recently Prepared Administrators Seeking Secondary Principalship Positions

1976-77 to 1978-79 by State, Sex, and Degree

State	Sex	1976 - 77 Masters n	% [a]	Ed. S. n	% [a]	Doctors n	% [a]	1977 - 78 Masters n	% [a]	Ed. S. n	% [a]	Doctors n	% [a]	1978 - 79 Masters n	% [a]	Ed. S. n	% [a]	Doctors n	% [a]	Total: 1976-77 to 1978-79 Masters n	% [a]	Ed. S. n	% [a]	Doctors n	% [a]
California	Men	100	(76)	6	(100)	4	(80)	55	(86)	1	(100)	3	(60)	74	(70)	9	(82)	4	(67)	229	(69)	16	(89)	11	(69)
(n=14)	Women	32	(24)	0		1	(20)	9	(14)	0		2	(40)	32	(30)	2	(18)	2	(33)	73	(31)	2	(11)	5	(31)
Georgia	Men	2	(100)	0		0		1	(100)	2	(100)	0		4	(100)	6	(100)	0		7	(100)	8	(100)	0	
(n=2)	Women	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
Indiana	Men	74	(84)	19	(86)	3	(100)	97	(78)	6	(86)	7	(88)	48	(63)	5	(83)	0		219	(76)	30	(86)	10	(83)
(n=7)	Women	14	(16)	3	(14)	0		27	(22)	1	(14)	1	(12)	28	(37)	1	(17)	1	(100)	69	(24)	5	(14)	2	(17)
Mass.	Men	18	(100)	0		0		17	(100)	0		0		18	(95)	0		0		53	(98)	0		0	
(n=5)	Women	0		0		0		0		0		0		1	(5)	0		0		1	(2)	0		0	
Nebraska	Men	5	(71)	0		0		7	(88)	0		0		7	(100)	0		0		19	(86)	0		0	
(n=4)	Women	2	(29)	0		0		1	(12)	0		0		0		0		0		3	(14)	0		0	
Texas	Men	34	(69)	12	(67)	2	(100)	35	(69)	11	(73)	3	(60)	33	(66)	10	(77)	2	(100)	102	(68)	33	(72	7	(78)
(n=11)	Women	15	(31)	6	(33)	0		16	(31)	4	(27)	2	(40)	17	(34)	3	(23)	0		48	(32)	13	(28)	2	(22)
All States	Men	233	(79)	37	(80)	10	(92)	212	(80)	20	(80)	13	(72)	184	(70)	30	(83)	6	(67)	629	(76)	87	(81)	28	(76)
	Women	63	(21)	9	(20)	1	(8)	53	(20)	5	(20)	5	(28)	78	(30)	6	(17)	3	(33)	194	(24)	20	(19)	9	(24)

[a]Reflects percentage of male and female degree recipients for each state by year

Table 4

Recently Prepared Administrators Seeking Elementary Principalship Positions

1976-77 to 1978-79 by State, Sex, and Degree

State	Sex	1976 - 77 Masters n	%	Ed. S. n	%	Doctors n	%	1977 - 78 Masters n	%	Ed. S. n	%	Doctors n	%	1978 - 79 Masters n	%	Ed. S. n	%	Doctors n	%	Total: 1976-77 to 1978-79 Masters n	%	Ed. S. n	%	Doctors n	%
California (n=14)	Men	78	(58)	6	(100)	0		64	(57)	1	(100)	0		53	(42)	9	(82)	3	(50)	195	(52)	16	(89)	3	(33)
	Women	56	(42)	0		2	(100)	49	(43)	0		1	(100)	73	(58)	2	(18)	3	(50)	178	(48)	2	(11)	6	(67)
Georgia (n=2)	Men	1	(50)	0		0		2	(100)	1	(50)	0		0		0		0		3	(75)	1	(25)	0	
	Women	1	(50)	2	(100)	0		0		1	(50)	0		0		0		0		1	(25)	3	(75)	0	
Indiana (n=7)	Men	42	(70)	5	(100)	1	(100)	41	(50)	0		0		30	(51)	4	(100)	0		113	(56)	9	(100)	1	(33)
	Women	18	(30)	0		0		41	(50)	0		1	(100)	29	(49)	0		1	(100)	88	(44)	0		2	(67)
Mass. (n=5).	Men	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
	Women	2	(100)	0		0		1	(100)	0		0		0		1	(100)	0		3	(100)	1	(100)	0	
Nebraska (n=4)	Men	2	(29)	0		0		4	(40)	0		0		3	(27)	0		0		9	(32)	0		0	
	Women	5	(71)	0		0		6	(60)	0		0		8	(73)	0		0		19	(68)	0		0	
Texas (n=11)	Men	32	(80)	9	(69)	2	(50)	20	(57)	9	(69)	3	(60)	29	(69)	8	(67)	2	(50)	81	(76)	26	(68)	7	(54)
	Women	8	(20)	4	(31)	2	(50)	15	(43)	4	(31)	2	(40)	13	(31)	4	(33)	2	(50)	36	(34)	12	(32)	6	(46)
All States	Men	155	(57)	20	(77)	3	(43)	131	(54)	11	(69)	3	(43)	129	(51)	21	(75)	5	(45)	415	(56)	52	(74)	11	(44)
	Women	97	(43)	6	(33)	4	(57)	112	(46)	5	(31)	4	(57)	123	(49)	7	(25)	6	(55)	332	(44)	18	(26)	14	(56)

[a]Reflects percentage of male and female degree recipients for each state by year

Table 5

Recently Prepared Administrators Seeking Special Education Administration Positions

1976-77 to 1978-79 by State, Sex, and Degree

State	Sex	1976 - 77						1977 - 78						1978 - 79						Total: 1976-77 to 1978-79					
		Masters		Ed. S.		Doctors		Masters		Ed. S.		Doctors		Masters		Ed. S.		Doctors		Masters		Ed. S.		Doctors	
		n	%[a]	n	%[a]	n	%[a]	n	%[a]	n	%[a]	n	%[a]	n	%[a]	n	%[a]	n	%[a]	n	%[a]	n	%[a]	n	%[a]
California (n=14)	Men	3	(43)	0		0		4	(50)	0		0		3	(27)	9	(100)	2	(100)	10	(39)	9	(100)	2	(67)
	Women	4	(57)	0		1	(100)	4	(50)	0		0		8	(73)	0		0		16	(61)	0		1	(33)
Georgia (n=2)	Men																								
	Women																								
Indiana (n=7)	Men	1	(33)	0		0		2	(100)	0		0		1	(50)	0		0		4	(57)	0		0	
	Women	2	(67)	0		0		0		0		0		1	(50)	0		1	(100)	3	(43)	0		1	(100)
Mass. (n=5)	Men	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
	Women	1	(100)	0		0		1	(100)	0		0		0		1	(100)	0		2	(100)	1	(100)	0	
Nebraska (n=4)	Men																								
	Women																								
Texas (n=11)	Men	0		0		0		1	(7)	0		0		1	(8)	0		0		2	(6)	0		0	
	Women	7	(100)	0		2	(100)	13	(93)	0		2	(100)	11	(92)	0		2	(100)	31	(94)	0		6	(100)
All States	Men	4	(22)	0		0		7	(28)	0		0		5	(20)	9	(90)	2	(40)	16	(28)	9	(90)	2	(20)
	Women	14	(78)	0		3	(100)	18	(72)	0		2	(100)	20	(80)	1	(10)	3	(60)	42	(72)	1	(10)	8	(80)

[a]Reflects percentage of male and female degree receipients for each state by year

Table 6

Additions (AIF) and Reductions in Force (RIF) by State,

Type of District, and Level, 1975-76 to 1978-79 and 1979-80

	Urban (n = 6)				Suburban (n = 11)				Medium City (n = 10)			
	1975-76 to 78-79		1979-80		1975-76 to 78-79		1979-80		1975-76 to 78-79		1979-80	
	AIF	RIF	AIF	RIF	AIF	RIF	AIF	RIF	AIF	RIF	AIF	RIF
California (n = 7)												
Central Office	27	0	0	3	5	5	0	0	1	2	0	2
Bldg. Admin.	5	11	5	1	3	2	0	0	3	0	0	1
Total	32	11	5	4	8	7	0	0	4	2	0	3
Georgia (n = 4)												
Central Office	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bldg. Admin.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indiana (n = 7)												
Central Office	11	0	5	2	1	0	0	0	10	13	3	3
Bldg. Admin.	0	18	1	6	1	1	1	0	1	6	0	4
Total	11	18	6	8	2	1	1	0	11	19	3	7
Mass. (n = 7)												
Central Office	1	3	0	1	0	2	0	0	8	4	0	3
Bldg. Admin.	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0
Total	5	3	0	1	0	3	0	0	8	7	0	3
Nebraska (n = 7)												
Central Office	2	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Bldg. Admin.	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Total	2	3	0	3	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Texas (n = 6)												
Central Office	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	3	0
Bldg. Admin.	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	5	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	8	0	3	0
Total Central	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %
Office Admin.	41 89	5 11	5 38	8 62	8 53	7 47	0	0	23 55	19 45	6 40	9 60
Total Bldg. Admin.	9 23	30 77	6 43	8 57	7 64	4 36	1 33	2 67	10 53	9 47	0	6 100
Combined Total	50 59	35 41	11 41	16 59	15 58	11 42	1 33	2 67	33 61	28 39	6 29	15 71

Table 6, continued

Additions (AIF) and Reductions in Force (RIF) by State, Type of District, and Level, 1975-76 to 1978-79 and 1979-80

	Rural (n = 11)								Total							
	1975-76 to 78-79				1979-80				1975-76 to 78-79				1979-80			
	AIF		RIF		AIF		RIF		AIF		RIF		AIF		RIF	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
California (n = 7)																
Central Office	1		0		0		0		34	83	7	17	0	-	5	100
Bldg. Admin.	0		0		0		0		11	46	13	54	5	71	2	29
Total	1		0		0		0		45	69	20	31	5	42	7	58
Georgia (n = 4)																
Central Office	0		0		2		1		0		0		2	67	1	33
Bldg. Admin.	0		0		0		0		0		0		0		0	
Total	0		0		2		1		0		0		2	67	1	33
Indiana (n = 7)																
Central Office	0		0		0		0		22	63	13	37	8	61	5	39
Bldg. Admin.	0		0		0		0		2	7	25	93	2	17	10	33
Total	0		0		0		0		24	39	38	61	10	40	15	60
Mass. (n = 7)																
Central Office	1		0		0		0		10	53	9	17	0		4	100
Bldg. Admin.	0		0		1		0		4	50	4	50	1	100	0	
Total	1		0		1		0		14	52	13	48	1	20	4	80
Nebraska (n = 7)																
Central Office	0		0		0		0		4	67	2	33	0		3	100
Bldg. Admin.	0		0		0		0		2	67	1	33	0		2	100
Total	0		0		0		0		6	67	3	33	0		5	100
Texas (n = 6)																
Central Office	3		0		0		0		7	100	0		3	100	0	
Bldg. Admin.	0		0		0		0		7	100	0		0		2	100
Total	3		0		0		0		14	100	0		3	60	2	40
Total Central Office Admin.	5	100	0		2	67	1	33	77	71	31	29	13	42	18	58
Total Bldg. Admin.	0		0		1	100	0		26	38	43	62	8	33	16	67
Combined Total	5	100	0		3	75	1	25	103	58	74	42	21	38	34	62

Table 7

School Administrators Hired Between 1975-76 and 1979-80 (Recent Hires) and Incumbent School Administrators (1979-80) By Position and Type of District

	Urban (n = 6)				Suburban (n = 11)				Medium City (n = 10)				Rural (n = 11)			
	Recent Hires		Incumbents		Rec. Hires		Incumb.		Rec. Hires		Incumbents		Rec. Hires		Incumb.	
CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATION	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ass't. or Assoc. Supt.	5	.8	34	2	8	16	10	7	12	5	29	4	4	8	6	7
Administrative Assistant	13	2	42	3	2	4	3	2	7	3	9	1	2	4	4	5
Director of Special Educ.	-		6	.3	3	6	4	3	4	2	11	2	2	4	3	4
Director of Federally Funded Programs	4	.7	6	.3	1	2	1	.7	11	5	10	1	2	4	11	13
Other Directors, i.e., Elem., Counseling & Guidance, etc.	8	1	58	4	2	4	3	2	10	4	59	9	2	4	4	5
Special Education Supervisor	35	6	41	2	1	2	1	.7	4	2	15	2	1	2	1	1
Supervisor of Federally Funded Programs	4	.7	9	.5	-		-		5	2	8	1	-		-	
Other Supervisors, i.e., Media, Curriculum, etc.	26	5	94	6	5	10	3	2	43	18	76	11	3	6	1	1
Other Central Office Admin.[a]	111	19	258	16	3	6	8	6	8	3	66	10	2	4	5	6
Subtotal	206	36	548	34	25	49	33	24	104	42	283	41	18	15	35	42
BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS																
Elementary Principal	55	10	350	21	5	10	47	35	43	18	190	29	8	17	17	20
Ass't. Elementary Principal	34	6	94	6	-		1	.7	15	6	15	2	1	2	1	1
Middle or Jr. High Sch. Prin.	23	4	64	4	4	8	11	8	7	3	28	4	2	4	7	8
Ass't. Middle or Jr. High School Principal	19	3	74	4	3	6	15	11	16	6	39	6	4	8	6	7
High School Principal	13	2	41	2	8	16	12	9	16	6	39	6	7	15	10	12
Ass't. High School Principal	20	4	96	6	6	12	17	12	30	12	61	9	7	15	7	8
Other Bldg. Administrators	200	35	361	22	-		-		14	6	27	4	-		1	1
Subtotal	364	64	1,080	66	26	51	103	76	141	58	399	59	29	62	49	58
TOTAL	570		1,628		51		136		245		682		47		84	
Proportion of Recent Hires	35%				37%				36%				56%			

[a]Includes staff development directors, program evaluators, directors of research and evaluation, bilingual education coordinators, community education coordinators, etc.

Table 7, continued

School Administrators Hired Between 1975-76 and 1979-80 (Recent Hires) and Incumbent School Administrators (1979-80) By Position and Type of District

	Total				Proportion of Recent Hires
	Recent Hires		Incumbents		
CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATION	n	%	n	%	
Ass't. or Assoc. Supt.	29	3	79	3	37%
Administrative Assistant	24	3	58	2	41%
Director of Special Educ.	9	1	24	1	37%
Director of Federally Funded Programs	18	2	28	1	64%
Other Directors, i.e., Elem., Counseling & Guidance, etc.	22	2	124	5	18%
Special Education Supervisor	41	4	58	2	71%
Supervisor of Federally Funded Programs	9	1	17	1	53%
Other Supervisors, i.e., Media, Curriculum, etc.	77	8	174	7	44%
Other Central Office Admin.[a]	124	14	337	13	37%
Subtotal	353	39	899	36	39%
BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS					
Elementary Principal	111	12	604	24	18%
Ass't. Elementary Principal	50	5	111	4	45%
Middle or Jr. High Sch. Prin.	36	4	110	4	33%
Ass't. Middle or Jr. High School Principal	42	5	134	5	31%
High School Principal	44	5	102	4	43%
Ass't. High School Principal	63	7	181	7	35%
Other Bldg. Administrators	214	23	389	15	55%
Subtotal	560	61	1,631	64	34%
TOTAL	913		2,530		36%

[a]Includes staff development directors, program evaluators, directors of research and evaluation, bilingual education coordinators, community education coordinators, etc.

Table 8

Placement of Recently Prepared Administrators by State,

Type of Position, and Location of Employment - 1976-77 to 1978-79

Type of Position	California n = 15 institutions						Georgia n = 2 institutions						Indiana n = 5 institutions					
	In state		Out of state		Total		In state		Out of state		Total		In state		Out of state		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Central Office	224	30	9	1	233	31	85	33	36	14	121	47	97	17	36	6	133	23
Building Admin.	298	39	11	1	309	41	71	28	7	3	78	31	277	48	64	11	341	59
Teaching	128	17	3	.4	131	17	16	6	11	4	27	10	40	7	10	2	50	9
Education Agency	15	2	2	.3	17	2	3	1	1	0	4	1	9	1	1	.2	10	1
Other/not placed	52	7	15	2	67	9	17	7	9	4	26	11	32	5	15	3	47	8
Total	717	95	40	5	757	100	192	75	64	25	256	100	455	78	126	22	581	100

Table 8, continued

Placement of Recently Prepared Administrators by State,

Type of Position, and Location of Employment - 1976-77 to 1978-79

Type of Position	Massachusetts n = 3 institutions						Nebraska n = 3 institutions						Texas n = 10 institutions						All States n = 38 institutions					
	In state		Out of state		Total		In state		Out of state		Total		In state		Out of state		Total		In state		Out of state		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Central Office	40	17	5	2	45	19	30	21	1	1	31	22	221	31	8	1	229	32	697	26	95	3	792	29
Building Admin.	24	10	10	4	34	14	81	58	3	2	84	60	305	42	37	5	342	47	1,056	39	132	5	1,188	44
Teaching	88	37	38	16	126	53	18	13	0	0	18	13	94	13	14	2	108	15	384	14	76	3	461	17
Education agency	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	3	2	14	2	1	.1	15	2	44	2	5	.2	49	2
Other/not placed	23	10	11	4	34	14	4	3	0	0	4	3	25	3	4	.6	29	4	153	6	54	2	207	8
Total	175	74	64	26	239	100	136	97	4	3	140	100	659	91	64	9	723	100	2,334	87	362	13	2,696	100